

A Nonparametric Bayesian Basket Trial Design

Yanxun Xu,^{*} Peter Müller,[†] Apostolia M Tsimberidou [‡]

Donald Berry [§]

Abstract

Targeted therapies on the basis of genomic aberrations analysis of the tumor have shown promising results in cancer prognosis and treatment. Regardless of tumor type, trials that match patients to targeted therapies for their particular genomic aberrations have become a mainstream direction of therapeutic management of patients with cancer. Therefore, finding the subpopulation of patients who can most benefit from an aberration-specific targeted therapy across multiple cancer types is important. We propose an adaptive Bayesian clinical trial design for patient allocation and subpopulation identification. We start with a decision theoretic approach, including a utility function and a probability model across all possible subpopulation models. The main features of the proposed design and

^{*}Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD.

Email: yxu.stat@gmail.com

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX. Email: pmueller@math.utexas.edu

[‡]Department of Investigational Cancer Therapeutics, The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX. Email: atsimber@mdanderson.org

[§]Department of Biostatistics, The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX. Email: dberry@mdanderson.org

population finding methods are that we allow for variable sets of covariates to be recorded by different patients, adjust for missing data, allow high order interactions of covariates, and the adaptive allocation of each patient to treatment arms using the posterior predictive probability of which arm is best for each patient. The new method is demonstrated via extensive simulation studies.

Key Words: Basket Trials; Bayesian adaptive designs; Subpopulation identification; Targeted therapies.

1 Introduction

We propose an adaptive Bayesian clinical trial design for patient allocation and sub-population finding in a heterogeneous patient population in basket trials. We focus on the objectives of allocating patients to their superior treatments and identifying a sub-population of patients who are most likely to benefit from the targeted therapy under consideration.

Recent developments of genomic profiling technologies (Van de Vijver et al., 2002; Snijders et al., 1998; Curtis et al., 2012; Baladandayuthapani et al., 2010; Barski and Zhao, 2009; Xu et al., 2013) have revolutionized the traditional diagnosis and treatment of cancer, leading to the development of targeted therapies designed to target specific biomarkers and molecular pathways involved in the pathophysiology of tumor initiation, metastasis, and drug resistance. For example, matching genomic aberrations with targeted therapies has led to the use of trastuzumab on HER2+ breast cancer (Hudis, 2007), and the recommendation against EGFR antibodies therapy for KRAS mutated colorectal cancer (Misale et al., 2012).

Some studies investigate the matching of tumor molecular alterations regardless of patient’s tumor type. One of the first such trials was the IMPACT (Initiative for Molecular Profiling and Advanced Cancer Therapy) study (Tsimberidou, 2009; Tsimberidou et al., 2012) which investigated the use of targeted agents matched with tumor molecular aberrations, and the following study IMPACT II (Tsimberidou, 2014) which we describe in this paper. Such trials are known as “basket” trials. Similar later studies that followed this example include the Lung-MAP (NCT021544490) and MATCH trials (Conley and Doroshow, 2014), which enrolled patients into sub-studies based on their genomic alterations. Next-generation sequencing (NGS) is used to identify patients with

a specific genomic alteration or mutation, regardless of the specific cancer. Patients are then enrolled in a trial to assess a particular molecularly targeted therapy. For instance, BRAF is a relatively common mutation in patients with melanoma, for which Vemurafenib (Zelboraf) was approved in 2011, but also occurs less frequently in other types of cancer. Researchers found that the drug showed little efficacy in patients with BRAF-mutant colorectal cancer (Yang et al., 2012). Therefore, finding the subpopulation of patients who can benefit from a mutation-specific experimental therapy across multiple tumor types is important to “basket” trials. For example, Hyman et al. (2015) systematically studied Vemurafenib in 122 patients with non-melanoma cancers harboring BRAF mutation and showed that Vemurafenib had efficacy for patients with BRAF mutation in non-small-cell lung cancer and Erhheim-Chester disease.

There is a growing literature to propose Bayesian approaches to identify subpopulations with enhanced treatment effects. The general problem of reporting exceptions to an overall conclusion of a clinical study is known as subgroup analysis. Dixon and Simon (1991) approach subgroup analysis as inference on treatment/covariate interaction effects. Simon (2002) uses a similar approach with independent priors on the interaction parameters. Sivaganesan et al. (2011) consider subgroup analysis as a model selection problem with each covariate defining a family of models. Ruberg et al. (2010) and Foster et al. (2011) develop tree-based algorithms to identify and evaluate subgroup effects by searching for regions with substantially enhanced treatment effects compared to the average effect, averaging across the covariate space. Sivaganesan et al. (2013) report subgroups within a Bayesian decision-theoretic framework. They determine rules using an extension of a 0/1/K utility function. The utility function is based on the posterior odds of subgroup models relative to the overall null and alternative models. Xu et al. (2014) identify subgroups of patients with substantially different treatment effect based

on a partition of the biomarker space using a variation of Bayesian classification and regression tree.

Several recent clinical trials explore the use of Bayesian adaptive designs, in combination with subpopulation finding designs. Prominent examples include the breast cancer trial ISPY-2 (Barker et al., 2009) that uses indicators for several biomarkers and a MammaPrint risk score to define 14 subpopulations of possible practical interest. The design graduates subpopulations, that is, recommends a future phase III study; or drops subpopulations or treatment arms, that is, remove one of the 14 subpopulations or treatment arms from further consideration. A similar design is the BATTLE study of Zhou et al. (2008) who define 5 subpopulations of lung cancer patients based on biomarker profiles and proceed to adaptively allocate patients to alternative treatments. Another recent discussion is Berry et al. (2013) who include a comparison of Bayesian adaptive designs, including a design based on a hierarchical model over different subpopulations with a comparable design using Simon’s optimal two-stage design (Simon, 2012).

In this paper, we build on these earlier approaches and propose an adaptive Bayesian clinical trial design for patient allocation and a decision theoretic approach for subpopulation finding in a heterogeneous patient population. The two novel key features of the proposed design are that we allow for variable sets of covariates and we allow the reported subpopulation to be characterized by a combination of, in principle, arbitrarily many covariates. Methodologically, we cast the problem as a decision problem and separate the assumed sampling model and the decision problem. The important implication is that the description of the desired subpopulation does not hinge on inference for parameters in the sampling model, but is treated as a separate element in the statistical inference problem.

To proceed, we first introduce the IMPACT II study in Section 2. The proposed design

is summarized in Section 3. Next, in Section 4 we discuss the subpopulation selection. The discussion is possible without reference to details of the probability model. In Section 5 we introduce the survival regression model with variable dimension covariate vector. Section 6 reports a simulation study. Finally, we conclude with a discussion in Section 7.

2 IMPACT II

The proposed design is motivated by a clinical trial, IMPACT II (Tsimberidou, 2014; Tsimberidou et al., 2014a), conducted at M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, based on data from multiple tumor types and molecular aberrations. The primary objective of the study is to determine if patients treated with a targeted therapy (TT) that is selected based on mutational analysis of the tumor have longer progression-free survival than those treated with other therapy (O). An important secondary aim is to identify a subpopulation of patients who might most benefit from targeted therapy. In other words, identify a subpopulation that could best define eligibility criteria for a future study of targeted therapy. Genomic analysis of tumor samples is performed at the time of enrollment to identify tumor molecular aberrations and to assign treatment for every individual patient.

Related observational data from a comparable patient population is reported in the IMPACT study (Tsimberidou, 2009; Tsimberidou et al., 2012, 2014b). This previous exploratory, non-randomized study was also performed at M.D. Anderson Cancer Center to test whether the use of targeted agents matches with tumor molecular aberrations would improve clinical outcomes compared to the standard approach. Figure 1 summarizes the data as a Kaplan-Meier plot comparing TT versus O. The plot indicates that patients with cancer who were treated with TT based on their tumor molecular profiling (labeled “matched” in the figure) could have superior clinical outcomes compared to those who were treated with the conventional approach (“non-matched”). However,

this exploratory study was not randomized. Unknown confounding factors may have contributed to higher rates of response and longer time to treatment failure and survival in patients treated with TT compared to those treated with O. One possible confounding factor could be a more favorable prognosis for patients treated with TT, such as EGFR mutation, which is well known to confer a more favorable prognosis.

To overcome the limitations of the previous exploratory study and to quantify any benefits of assigning therapy based on mutational analysis over standard therapy, we use a randomized study for IMPACT II. For each enrolled patient we record a set of molecular aberrations, $\mathbf{m}_i = (m_{i1}, \dots, m_{iq})$ and tumor type c_i and we decide a treatment allocation $z_i \in \{\text{O}, \text{TT}\}$ for either targeted therapy matched to a molecular aberration (TT), or other therapy, excluding targeted therapy (O). Importantly, the set of molecular aberrations that is recorded for each patient can vary substantially. We use $m_{ij} = \text{NA}$ for not recorded aberrations and $m_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ for the absence or presence of recorded aberrations, respectively. Denote the combined covariate vector by $\mathbf{x}_i = (\mathbf{m}_i, c_i)$. Finally, y_i records progression free survival (PFS) time.

The proposed design is based on a survival regression for PFS y_i as a function of $\mathbf{x}_i$ and z_i . Continuously updated inference under this model is used for adaptive treatment allocation during the trial. Patients are assigned to TT or O with probabilities that are related to the predictive distribution of PFS under the two treatment arms. At the end of the trial we use inference under the same model to recommend a patient population for a future trial.

3 Design

Patients with metastatic cancer (any tumor type) and up to three prior therapies will undergo tumor biopsy followed by molecular profiling. For each patient we record tumor

type and presence/absence of a set of molecular aberrations, including PIK3CA, PTEN, BRAF, MET, and “others” (including but not limited to FGFR alterations). Patients with colorectal cancer and BRAF mutation were excluded because of available data demonstrating that these inhibitors have no activity as single agents.

If at least one molecular alteration is identified, the patient will be treated as follows: if there is a U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved drug within the labeled indication, the patient will receive it; if there is no approved drug for the alteration and the tumor type, but there is a commercially available targeted agent or appropriate clinical trial, patients will be randomly selected to receive targeted therapy (TT) versus treatment not selected on the basis of genetic profiling (O). The allocation probabilities for the random selection are specified as follows in an initial run-in phase and a later adaptive allocation phase of the trial.

Run-in phase. We initiate the study with a run-in phase consisting of $n_0 = 100$ randomized patients. During this phase, patients who are selected for randomization (as described above) are equally randomized to the two treatment arms TT vs. O.

Adaptive allocation. After the initial run-in of 100 patients, we introduce adaptive randomization for the next $n_1 = 300$ patients with a cohort size 50, allowing for a total of $n_{\max} = 400$ randomized patients. For the adaptive randomization, we use model-based posterior predictive probabilities. We discuss details of the model specification later. Let π_i denote the posterior probability, based on current data, that PFS time under TT is greater than survival under O for patient i . See §5.3 for the evaluation of π_i in the implemented probability model. Let $z_i \in \{\text{TT}, \text{O}\}$ denote the treatment allocation for patient i . For patients who are selected for randomization (as described above), we use

adaptive treatment allocation

$$p(z_i = \text{TT}) = \begin{cases} p_0 & \text{if } \pi_i < p_0 \\ \pi_i & \text{if } p_0 < \pi_i < p_1 \\ p_1 & \text{if } \pi_i > p_1. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

We use $p_0 = 0.1$ and $p_1 = 0.9$.

Subpopulation finding. Finally, at the conclusion of the trial (6 months after 400 patients accrue), we assess subpopulation-specific effects of targeted therapies. We report the subpopulations that achieve the maximum benefit from targeted therapies. This assessment is based on the posterior expected utilities of all possible subpopulations. The utilities depend on the characteristics of subpopulations as well as the posterior probability model under an estimated regression for PFS. We shall evaluate the log hazards ratio with respect to PFS. This will be measured from the time of initiation of treatment to disease progression or death, as of the last follow-up visit. Details of the subpopulation finding are described below, in §4.

4 Population Finding

Recall that $\mathbf{m}_i = (m_{i1}, \dots, m_{iq})$ denotes a vector of recorded molecular aberrations and $\mathbf{x}_i = (\mathbf{m}_i, c_i)$. We characterize a subpopulation as a set of mutation-tumor pairs $A = \{a : a = (j_a, c_a)\}$, with $j_a \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ identifying a molecular aberration and $c_a \in \{1, \dots, n_c\}$ denoting tumor type. Each $a \in A$ denotes the subgroup of patients with aberration $m_{j_a} = 1$ and tumor $c_i = c_a$. For example, consider the subpopulation report consisting of two subgroups, including patients with lung cancer and BRAF mutation, and patients with breast cancer and PIK3CA mutation. We denote this subpopulation by $\{(\text{BRAF}, \text{Lung}), (\text{PIK3CA}, \text{Breast})\}$. If needed this characterization could incorporate other baseline covariates of interests and/or higher order interactions of covariates to de-

scribe subpopulations. However, we do not use such extensions in IMPACT II, restricting subsets to be characterized by mutation-tumor pairs (j_a, c_a) . We add two special cases of subpopulation reports: Let $A = H_0$ denote the report of no subpopulations *and* no overall treatment effect; and let $A = H_1$ denote the report of an overall treatment effect, but no subpopulations.

We use a decision theoretic approach to find an optimal decision A^* . We start by quantifying the relative preferences across possible reports A^* . That is, we specify a utility function. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ denote parameters of the underlying survival regression. We still do not need to make any specific assumptions about the model, except for the existence of such a model. Given parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and covariate vector $\mathbf{x}$, we assume that there is a sampling model $p(y \mid z, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for PFS. A utility function is a function $u(A, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for an assumed action A and a hypothetical true parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. In general the utility function could also depend on observed or future data, but dependence on $(A, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ suffices for the upcoming application.

We define a utility function based on the notion that a clinically important subpopulation should show a significant treatment effect for a large population. Since patient's response is survival time, it would be apt to measure the beneficial treatment effect by the hazard ratio of TT relative to O. A minor complication arises from the fact that in the particular probability model that we shall use a natural parametrization of hazard ratios does not exist. In general hazard ratios depend on time. We define a hazard ratio as follows. Denote by $S(t, z, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = p(y \geq t \mid z, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ the survival function at time t for a patient with covariate vector $\mathbf{x}$ under an assumed model with parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Similarly, $H(t, z, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\log\{S(t, z, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\}$ defines cumulative hazard. Next, we define an average hazard

$$AH(z, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = H(T, z, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/T \tag{4.1}$$

for a chosen horizon T . In our implementation we fix T as the third quantile of the empirical distribution of the observed PFS times in the data reported in Tsimberidou et al. (2012). Using the empirical distribution of $\mathbf{x}_i$, we define an AH for a mutation-tumor pair a as $\text{AH}_a(a, z, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n(a)} \sum_{i=1}^{n(a)} \text{AH}(z, \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ (no problem with zero division arises since we will only use AH for a with $n(a) > 0$). Here the sum goes over all patients whose covariates fall within the mutation-tumor pair described by a and $n(a)$ denotes the number of such patients. Finally a pair-specific hazard ratio

$$\text{HR}(a, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\text{AH}_a(a, O, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\text{AH}_a(a, TT, \boldsymbol{\theta})}.$$

$\text{HR}(a, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1$ means no difference of average hazard exists between O and TT for mutation-tumor pair a . We define a utility function,

$$u(A, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{cases} u_0 I(A = H_0) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{\theta} \text{ is } H_0 \\ \sum_{a \in A} \left\{ \{\log[\text{HR}(a, \boldsymbol{\theta})] - \beta\} f_\alpha(a) \right\} & \text{otherwise} \\ u_1 I(A = H_1) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{\theta} \text{ is } H_1, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where $f_\alpha(a)$ is a function on mutation-tumor pairs that penalizes for small subgroups (see below) and $\beta > 0$ is a fixed threshold of minimum clinically meaningful difference in log hazard. The condition “ $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is H_0 ” refers to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ defining a sampling model with no treatment effects for any patients. Similarly, “ $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is H_1 ” refers to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ defining a sampling model with the same treatment effect across all patients in the eligible population. The broad idea of $u(A, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is to favor the report of large subgroups with a meaningful treatment effect, and a preference for reporting the overall null or alternative if appropriate. However, the specific formalization in (4.2) remains arbitrary. For example, one could argue to replace $\log[\text{HR}(a, \boldsymbol{\theta})]$ by $\log[\text{HR}(a, \boldsymbol{\theta})] - \log[\text{HR}(H_1, \boldsymbol{\theta})]$, that is a treatment effect relative to an overall treatment effect. In the current application an overall treatment effect of targeted therapy across all cancers and across all patients is a priori unlikely and can be ignored.

For the same reason we do not include a scaling of the payoff u_1 by a possible overall treatment effect $\log[\text{HR}(H_1, \boldsymbol{\theta})]$. In other applications such modifications could be useful.

The definition of $f_\alpha(a)$ is based on the following considerations. Mutation-tumor pairs with small $n(a)$ should be penalized, as they are of less clinical interest and at the same time inference is subject to substantial predictive uncertainty. In summary, we use

$$f_\alpha(a) = \begin{cases} 0 & n(a) < 5 \\ n(a)^\alpha & n(a) \geq 5. \end{cases}$$

Here $n(a)$ denotes the size of the subgroup that is characterized by a . In this specification of the utility function, the constants $(u_0, u_1, \alpha, \beta)$ are tuning parameters. Later we will discuss strategies to fix them.

Recall that we assume that there exists a sampling model for the observed data, and that the model is indexed by a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Let $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ denote all observed outcomes, and let $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_i, z_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ denote the known covariates and treatment assignments. We write $p(\mathbf{y} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{X})$. Now add one more assumption by completing the probability model with a prior $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for the unknown parameters, implying a posterior probability model $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$. The utility function $u(A, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, together with $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ determine the optimal report for a subpopulation as

$$A^* = \arg \max_A \int u(A, \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}. \quad (4.3)$$

In words, the solution A^* is the subpopulation report that maximizes the decision criterion $u(A, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Since $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is unknown we average with respect to $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$. One can argue from first principles that this is how a rational decision maker should act (Robert, 1994). The expectation $U(A) \equiv \int u(A, \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}$, after integrating out all unknown quantities, is known as expected utility, and the rule A^* is known as the Bayes rule.

5 Probability Model

We use a nonparametric Bayesian survival model proposed in Müller et al. (2011) and Quintana et al. (2014). A similar model is proposed in Hannah et al. (2011). The model is based on a random partition of the experimental units $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$, in our case, the patients in the study. That is, patients are arranged in clusters based on patient-specific covariates $\mathbf{x}_i$. To avoid misunderstanding we note that this partition is unrelated to the population finding. Any alternative model, without clustering, could be used.

For each cluster the model includes a cluster-specific sampling model. For example, we use a log normal distribution. Let $S_j \subset [n]$ denote the j -th cluster and let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^\star$ denote cluster-specific parameters. A cluster-specific sampling model specifies $p(y_i \mid i \in S_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^\star)$. Let $\text{LN}(y; \mu, \sigma^2)$ indicate a log normal distributed random variable y , that is, $\log(y) \sim \text{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$. In our implementation we use $p(y_i \mid i \in S_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^\star = (\mu_j, \sigma_j^2)) = \text{LN}(y_i; \mu_j, \sigma_j^2)$. The main advantage of using a cluster-based regression model is that we can consider an arrangement of patients into clusters with similar covariates based on the *recorded* covariates only. Missing covariates, for example, not recorded molecular aberrations, are simply not used. Details are discussed below. We simply exploit the fact that it is easy and natural to talk about clustering experimental units on the basis of partially observed covariates, without any need to impute missing values.

We now formally define the survival regression model. The reader could now skip the rest of this section without compromising the rest of the discussion.

5.1 A survival regression with variable subsets of covariates

The model is best characterized by the predictive distribution

$$p(y_{n+1} \mid \mathbf{x}_{n+1}, z_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \text{ (recall that } \mathbf{X} \text{ includes the treatment assignments } z_1, \dots, z_n).$$

In words, we define a cluster-specific log normal sampling model. The posterior predictive distribution then averages with respect to the cluster membership for $i = n + 1$, with respect to the posterior distribution on the cluster-specific parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ and finally, with respect to the posterior distribution on the random partition. The latter average reduces to a sum over all possible partitions of $[n]$. For a formal description we need more notations.

Let $\rho_n = \{S_1, \dots, S_k\}$ denote the random partition (including the random size k of the partition). That is, there are k clusters $S_1, \dots, S_k$ with $\bigcup_{j=1}^k S_j = [n]$. Let $\mathbf{x}_j^* = \{\mathbf{x}_i, i \in S_j\}$ denote the covariates arranged by clusters. We first match $i = n + 1$ with one of the k current clusters based on matching $\mathbf{x}_{n+1}$ with $\mathbf{x}_j^*$. Conditional on $n + 1 \in S_j$ and conditional on $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ the prediction for y_{n+1} is $p(y_{n+1} \mid n + 1 \in S_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*) = \text{LN}(\mu_j, \sigma_j^2)$. The desired predictive distribution $p(y_{n+1} \mid \mathbf{x}_{n+1}, z_{n+1}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ is then defined by averaging $p(y_{n+1} \mid n + 1 \in S_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*)$ with respect to the cluster-specific parameters and with respect to the random partition. In summary,

$$p(y_{n+1} \mid \mathbf{x}_{n+1}, z_{n+1}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\rho_n} p(\rho_n \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) \int p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \mid \rho_n, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) \times \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} p(y_{n+1} \mid n + 1 \in S_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*) p(n + 1 \in S_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{n+1}, z_{n+1}, \mathbf{X}, \rho_n) \right\} d\boldsymbol{\theta}^*. \quad (5.1)$$

The innermost sum is the average with respect to the cluster membership for the $(n + 1)$ -st patient. Note that the cluster membership includes a regression on $\mathbf{x}_{n+1}$. We allocate the next patient with higher probability to existing clusters S_j with similar covariates $\mathbf{x}_j^*$. Also note that the average includes $j = k + 1$, that is, the possibility that $(n + 1)$ forms a new (singleton) cluster $S_{k+1} = \{n + 1\}$.

We complete the model description with a specification for $p(\rho_n \mid \mathbf{X})$ and eventually

a prior for $\theta_j^\star$. We use

$$p(\rho_n \mid \mathbf{X}) \propto \prod_{j=1}^k g(\mathbf{x}_j^\star) c(S_j). \quad (5.2)$$

This is a modification of the product partition model (PPM) $p(\rho_n) \propto \prod c(S_j)$ of Hartigan (1990). With $c(S_j) = M(|S_j| - 1)!$ the PPM reduces to the popular Polya urn model. See, for example, Quintana and Iglesias (2003) for a review. In (5.2) we modified the model to include a factor $g(\mathbf{x}_j^\star)$, which is chosen to favor clusters with similar $\mathbf{x}_i$. We refer to $g(\mathbf{x}_j^\star)$ as similarity function. For example, if x_i were a single categorical covariate, say tumor type, letting m_j denote the number of unique values x_i for $i \in S_j$ and $g(\mathbf{x}_j^\star) = 1/m_j$ would define a similarity function that favors homogeneous clusters with a single unique value x_i in each cluster. See Müller et al. (2011) for default choices for scalar covariates of other data formats.

We combine similarity functions for scalar covariates to define $g(\mathbf{x}_j^\star)$ for multivariate covariate vectors as follows. Let $R_i = \{\ell : x_{i\ell} \neq \text{NA}\}$ denote the set of recorded covariates for patient i and let $\mathbf{x}_{j\ell}^\star = \{x_{i\ell}, i \in S_j \text{ and } \ell \in R_i\}$. Let $g_\ell(\mathbf{x}_{j\ell}^\star)$ denote a similarity function for the ℓ -th covariate. We then define

$$g(\mathbf{x}_j^\star) = \prod_{\ell=1}^p g_\ell(\mathbf{x}_{j\ell}^\star).$$

That is, we define a product similarity function. The important feature is that we only make use of recorded covariate values and avoid imputing (massively) missing markers for molecular aberration. This offers a novel way to handle missing data, which we often encounter in large medical datasets. While general clustering and regression methods model missing data relying on imputation, the proposed model most naturally accommodates missing covariates by simply not using them in the evaluation of cluster membership probabilities.

5.2 Covariate interactions

Another motivation for the proposed model is its ability to elegantly model covariate interactions. Covariate interactions are simply represented by clusters that are very homogeneous in more than one corresponding covariates. A desirable side-effect of this construction is that the model can only use covariate interactions if the corresponding covariate-combinations are present in the data. This avoids and mitigates problems related to extrapolation and multiplicity concerns. In the current clinical setting, we expect significant predictive roles to be played by interactions among tumor types and different mutations. A standard way to model them is through additional interaction columns in the design matrix of a regression model. However, even with a handful of variables, the number of all possible terms becomes quickly too large. One could impose informative priors on the number and nature of such interactions, or restrict the order of all possible interactions. However these information often is not available. Moreover, it is not uncommon to find higher order interactions in absence of corresponding lower order terms.

5.3 Adaptive allocation

Adaptive treatment allocation in (3.1) requires the evaluation of π_i as the posterior probability of superiority of TT over O for patient i . Let y_i^0 and y_i^1 denote potential outcomes for patient i if the patient were allocated to O or TT, respectively and let $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})$ and $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_h, z_h, h < i\}$ denote the data on the first $i - 1$ patients.

Similar to (5.3) define

$$\begin{aligned}
p(y_i^0, y_i^1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \\
\sum_{\rho_{i-1}} \int p(y_i^1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i, z_i = TT, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \rho_{i-1}) p(y_i^0 \mid \mathbf{x}_i, z_i = O, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \rho_{i-1}) \\
p(\rho_{i-1} \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \mid \rho_{i-1}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}^*. \quad (5.3)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\pi_i = \int_{y_i^0 < y_i^1} dp(y_i^0, y_i^1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}).$$

The attraction of this definition of π_i is the evaluation with an available Monte Carlo sample, without the need for any additional simulation. This makes it suitable for fast on-line evaluation, as will be needed for an implementation of the proposed design when a clinical team has to rely on prompt and uncomplicated evaluation of allocation probabilities.

6 Simulation and Operating Characteristics

6.1 Simulation setup

We carry out extensive simulation studies to validate the model and the subpopulation finding. We include 6 scenarios specifying different log-normal regressions with possible interactions among treatment, mutations and tumor types. Using a log normal regression the simulation truth is deliberately selected to be a different model than the assumed analysis model. We use 400 hypothetical patient observations. The assumed effect sizes are chosen to match the order of magnitude of estimates with the observational data in IMPACT trial (shown in Table 1). The scenarios are listed in Table 2. For each scenario, we simulate 100 trials.

We evaluate the proposed inference with respect to two decisions, the treatment

allocation based on (3.1) and the subpopulation reports (4.3). For both evaluations we report summaries under repeated simulations. That is, we assume a setup where the proposed design is used repeatedly for multiple trials and performance is evaluated over these repeated simulations. Such summaries are known as (frequentist) operating characteristics. We use them to calibrate tuning parameters in the utility function.

6.2 Adaptive allocation

Figure 2 plots the average percentage of patients randomized to TT and O in each mutation-tumor pair with treatment effect different from the overall population under the simulation truth in scenarios 3-6. In scenario 3, where the pair (BRAF, Lung) has a favorable treatment effect, 74% of Lung patients with BRAF mutation are randomized to TT, indicating that more patients receive their superior treatment. In scenario 4, $\{(PIK3CA, BRCA), (BRAF, Lung), (PTEN, Lung)\}$ are mutation-tumor pairs with significantly higher treatment effects. In pairs (PIK3CA, BRCA) and (BRAF, Lung), 72% and 63% of all patients are randomized to TT, respectively. But for lung cancer patients with PTEN mutation, only 41% are assigned to TT. The reason is that only $n(a) = 5$ patients are in the pair (PTEN, Lung), as shown in Table 1. In the utility function (4.2), we penalize mutation-tumor pairs with few patients ($n(a) < 5$). In scenario 5, we assume increased treatment effects for mutation-tumor pairs $\{(PIK3CA, BRCA), (BRAF, Ovary), (BRAF, Lung)\}$. All three pairs include more than 50 patients. Figure 2 shows that more patients in these groups are allocated to their superior treatments, similarly for scenario 6.

6.3 Subpopulation finding

Next we evaluate the subpopulation finding (4.3) by summarizing, again over repeated simulations under a hypothetical truth, using in turn each of the 6 scenarios. We record

how accurately the proposed approach reports true subpopulations. We have to first define what we understand under a true subpopulation. Let θ^0 denote the true sampling model under one of the 6 scenarios. We first compute the utility function $U_0(A) \equiv u(A, \theta^0)$ for all possible subpopulations A under the true sampling model. That is, we replace the expectation in (4.3) by an expectation under the true sampling model. We then define the “true” subpopulation A^0 as the top subpopulation report with the largest utility $U_0(A)$. Post-analysis, we report A^* by (4.3).

In each scenario, we compute the percentage of trials in which each subgroup a is reported:

$$Pr(a) = \frac{1}{100} \sum_h I(a \in A_h^*).$$

That is, $Pr(a)$ are estimated (frequentist) probabilities over repeat simulations and h indexes each simulation. Figure 3 shows $Pr(a)$, that is A^* (right panel in each pair of panels), versus the simulation truth $U_0(A)$ (left panel).

6.4 Operating characteristics

The utility function depends on the parameters u_0, u_1, α , and β . We fix these parameters to achieve a desired error rate. For this purpose, we summarize several types of error rates. Recall that H_0 indicates the decision not to report any recommended subpopulation and H_1 indicates the decision to report the entire patient population. And recall the notation $A = \{a : a = (j_a, c_a)\}$ for any other subpopulation report. We will use superscript c to denote the absence of a particular report in the list of pairs in each subpopulation report. Finally, as before we use Pr to denote a frequentist rate of the various errors. That is, the probability under repeated simulations. For example $Pr(a^c | a) = \sum_h I(a \notin A_h^*)/100$ refers to the probability of not reporting mutation-tumor pair a ($a \notin A_h^*$) when the pair is among the true subpopulation ($a \in A^0$). The probability is evaluated as average over

100 repeated trials. There is a slight abuse of notation with the conditioning bar. In $\Pr(a \mid b)$, the first argument, a refers to a decision, and the second, b , refers to an event under the simulation truth. When A^0 includes multiple mutation-tumor pairs the rates include an average over all $a \in A^0$, as indicated below.

We report the following six error rates: 1) Type 1 error (TIE) = $\Pr(H_0^c \mid H_0)$; 2) TSR (true subgroup rate) = $\Pr(a \mid a) = \sum_{a \in A^0} \sum_h I(a \in A_h^*) / (100 \times |A^0|)$; 3) TPR (true positive rate) = $\Pr(H_1 \mid H_1)$; 4) FSR (false subgroup rate) = $\Pr(a \mid a^c) = \sum_{a \notin A^0} \sum_h I(a \in A_h^*) / (100 \times |(A^0)^c|)$; 5) FNR (false negative rate) = $\Pr(H_0 \mid H_0^c)$; 6) FPR (false positive rate) = $\Pr(H_1 \mid H_1^c)$. The selection of these error rates could be changed as desired. For example, for other applications it might be meaningful to report expected (under repeated simulation) false discovery rates, etc. All unknown parameters in the utility function (4.2) are calibrated to restrict TIE=0.05, shown in scenario 1 and TPR = 0.9, shown in scenario 2, $u_0 = 1.21$, $u_1 = 21.21$, $\alpha = 1/8$, and $\beta = 0.4$. Note that TIE and TPR are special cases of TSR, and FNR and FPR are special cases of FSR. Not all error rates are meaningful in all scenarios. For example, TIE is only meaningful when H_0 is in fact the true population under $U_0(A)$ and similar for TPR. Table 3 summarizes the 6 error rates in the 6 scenarios.

6.5 Inference and Comparison

For comparison, we implement two alternative trial designs: a simple two-arm randomization (NAIVE) and separate trials for each molecular aberration (SEPARATE). That is, NAIVE assigns patients equally to TT and O, and compares TT with O over the whole population. In particular, no subgroups are considered in the NAIVE design. In the SEPARATE design, we perform separate independent studies for each subgroup determined by mutation only, that is, “rows” in Figure 3. In other words, SEPARATE are five separate basket trials.

We compare the three methods based on the expected PFS time of a hypothetical future patient who is assigned the optimal treatment as estimated from these three methods. Subtracting (true) expected PFS under O, any comparison of expected PFS under the optimal treatment under different designs can equivalently be interpreted as a differences in treatment effects, defined as difference under optimal treatment and O (thus the acronym TE, below). Define $\text{TE}_{\mathbf{x}} = E_y(y \mid \mathbf{x}, z_{\mathbf{x}}^*)$ to be the expected treatment effect for a future patient with covariate $\mathbf{x}$ and treatment $z_{\mathbf{x}}^*$, where $z_{\mathbf{x}}^*$ is the optimal treatment for patient with covariate $\mathbf{x}$ inferred from posterior inference under the analysis model. For instance, the optimal treatment for patients in the reported subpopulation A^* in (4.3) is TT, otherwise O. Here E_y with respect to y is under the simulation truth. Define $\widehat{\text{TE}}_{\mathbf{x}} = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[E_{y|\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y \mid \mathbf{x}, z_{\mathbf{x}}^*)]$ as estimated PFS, where $E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is with respect to the posterior inference under the analysis model, and $E_{y|\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is under the analysis model. Furthermore, we define $\text{TE}_a = \text{TE}_{\mathbf{x}=(\mathbf{m},c):(m_{j_a}=1,c_i=c_a)}$ the expected PFS for the mutation-tumor pair $a = (j_a, c_a)$ under the simulation truth and $\widehat{\text{TE}}_a$ the estimated PFS. And, again, subtracting true PFS under O each of these summaries can be considered a summary on treatment effects.

Figure 4 plots $|\widehat{\text{TE}}_a - \text{TE}_a|$ for each mutation-tumor pair under the three methods: NAIVE, SEPARATE, and OURS. OURS refers to the proposed approach. We find that OURS reports the smallest differences among all mutation-tumor pairs.

7 Conclusion

We have outlined a Bayesian adaptive clinical trial design to assign patients to their superior treatment and a practicable decision theoretic approach to optimal subpopulation finding. The strengths of the proposed approach include: 1) we make decisions based on a flexible utility function that reflects the requirement of the clinicians appropriately and

realistically, such as rewarding the correct subpopulation reports and penalizing small size subpopulations; 2) we use a general class of probability models that efficiently incorporate treatment covariate as well as covariate-covariate interactions and adjust for missing value by the similarity functions on clusters.

There exist limitations. For example, the solution of the proposed decision theoretic approach depends on the often arbitrary choice of the unknown parameters in utility function. The problem is mitigated by calibrating frequentist operating characteristics like TIE.

Acknowledgement

Peter Müller and Yanxun Xu’s research is partly supported by NIH grant R01 CA132897.

References

- Baladandayuthapani, V., Ji, Y., Talluri, R., Nieto-Barajas, L., and Morris, J. (2010). Bayesian random segmentation models to identify shared copy number aberrations for array CGH data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105:1358–1375.
- Barker, A., Sigman, C., Kelloff, G., Hylton, N., Berry, D., and Esserman, L. (2009). I-SPY 2: an adaptive breast cancer trial design in the setting of neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, 86(1):97–100.
- Barski, A. and Zhao, K. (2009). Genomic location analysis by ChIP-Seq. *Journal of Cellular Biochemistry*, 107:11–18.
- Berry, S. M., Broglio, K. R., Groshen, S., and Berry, D. A. (2013). Bayesian hierarchical modeling of patient subpopulations: efficient designs of Phase II oncology clinical trials. *Clin Trials*, 10(5):720–734.

- Conley, B. A. and Doroshow, J. H. (2014). Molecular analysis for therapy choice: NCI MATCH. In *Seminars in Oncology*, volume 41, pages 297–299. Elsevier.
- Curtis, C., Shah, S., Chin, S., Turashvili, G., Rueda, O., Dunning, M., and et al. (2012). The genomic and transcriptomic architecture of 2,000 breast tumours reveals novel subgroups. *Nature*, 486:346–352.
- Dixon, D. O. and Simon, R. (1991). Bayesian subset analysis. *Biometrics*, 47:871–881.
- Foster, J. C., Taylor, J. M., and Ruberg, S. J. (2011). Subgroup identification from randomized clinical trial data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 30(24):2867–2880.
- Hannah, L., Blei, D., and Powell, W. (2011). Dirichlet process mixtures of generalized linear models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:1923–1953.
- Hartigan, J. A. (1990). Partition models. *Communications in Statistics: Theory and Methods*, 19:2745–2756.
- Hudis, C. A. (2007). Trastuzumab mechanism of action and use in clinical practice. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 357(1):39–51.
- Hyman, D. M., Puzanov, I., Subbiah, V., Faris, J. E., Chau, I., Blay, J.-Y., Wolf, J., Raje, N. S., Diamond, E. L., Hollebecque, A., et al. (2015). Vemurafenib in multiple nonmelanoma cancers with BRAF V600 mutations. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 373(8):726–736.
- Misale, S., Yaeger, R., Hobor, S., Scala, E., Janakiraman, M., Liska, D., Valtorta, E., Schiavo, R., Buscarino, M., Siravegna, G., et al. (2012). Emergence of KRAS mutations and acquired resistance to anti-EGFR therapy in colorectal cancer. *Nature*, 486(7404):532–536.

- Müller, P., Quintana, F. A., and Rosner, G. L. (2011). A Product Partition Model with Regression on Covariates. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 20(1):260–278.
- Quintana, F. A. and Iglesias, P. L. (2003). Bayesian Clustering and Product Partition Models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 65:557–574.
- Quintana, F. A., Müller, P., and Papoila, A. L. (2014). Cluster-specific variable selection for product partition models. Technical report, Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile.
- Robert, C. (1994). *The Bayesian Choice*. Springer-Verlag.
- Ruberg, S. J., Chen, L., and Wang, Y. (2010). The mean does not mean as much anymore: finding sub-groups for tailored therapeutics. *Clinical Trials*, 7(5):574–583.
- Simon, R. (2002). Bayesian subset analysis: application to studying treatment-by-gender interactions. *Statistics in Medicine*, 21(19):2909–2916.
- Simon, R. (2012). Clinical trials for predictive medicine. *Statistics in Medicine*, 31(25):3031–3040.
- Sivaganesan, S., Laud, P. W., and Müller, P. (2011). A Bayesian subgroup analysis with a zero-enriched Polya Urn scheme. *Statistics in Medicine*, 30(4):312–323.
- Sivaganesan, S., Laud, P. W., and Müller, P. (2013). Subgroup analysis. In Damien, P., Dellaportas, P., Polson, N., and Stephens, D., editors, *Bayesian Theory and Applications*, pages 576–592. Oxford University Press.
- Snijders, A., Nowak, N., Segraves, R., Blackwood, S., Brown, N., and et al. (1998). Assembly of microarrays for genome-wide measurement of DNA copy number. *Nature Genetics*, 29:263–264.

- Tsimberidou, A., N.G., I., Hong, D., Wheler, J., Falchook, G., Fu, S., Piha-Paul, S., Naing, A., Janku, F., Luthra, R., Ye, Y., Wen, S., Berry, D., and Kurzrock, R. (2012). Personalized medicine in a phase I clinical trials program: the MD Anderson Cancer Center initiative. *Clin Cancer Res.*, 18(22):6373–83.
- Tsimberidou, A. M. (2009). Initiative for molecular profiling in advanced cancer therapy (impact) trial, an umbrella protocol. [https://clinicaltrials.gov/, study NCT00851032](https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT00851032). accessed, 02/09/2017.
- Tsimberidou, A. M. (2014). IMPACT 2: Randomized study evaluating molecular profiling and targeted agents in metastatic cancer. [https://clinicaltrials.gov/, study NCT02152254](https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT02152254). accessed, 02/09/2017.
- Tsimberidou, A. M., Eggermont, A. M., and Schilsky, R. L. (2014a). Precision cancer medicine: the future is now, only better. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book*, pages 61–69.
- Tsimberidou, A. M., Wen, S., Hong, D. S., Wheler, J. J., Falchook, G. S., Fu, S., Piha-Paul, S., Naing, A., Janku, F., Aldape, K., Ye, Y., Kurzrock, R., and Berry, D. (2014b). Personalized medicine for patients with advanced cancer in the phase I program at MD Anderson: validation and landmark analyses. *Clin. Cancer Res.*, 20(18):4827–4836.
- Van de Vijver, M., He, Y., van’t Veer, L., Dai, H., Hart, A., Voskuil, D., and et al. (2002). A gene-expression signature as a predictor of survival in breast cancer. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 347:1999–2009.
- Xu, Y., Lee, J., Yuan, Y., Mitra, R., Liang, S., Müller, P., Ji, Y., et al. (2013). Non-parametric Bayesian bi-clustering for next generation sequencing count data. *Bayesian Analysis*, 8(4):759–780.

- Xu, Y., Trippa, L., Müller, P., and Ji, Y. (2014). Subgroup-based adaptive (suba) designs for multi-arm biomarker trials. *Statistics in Biosciences*, pages 1–22.
- Yang, H., Higgins, B., Kolinsky, K., Packman, K., Bradley, W. D., Lee, R. J., Schostack, K., Simcox, M. E., Kopetz, S., Heimbrook, D., et al. (2012). Antitumor activity of BRAF inhibitor vemurafenib in preclinical models of BRAF-mutant colorectal cancer. *Cancer Research*, 72(3):779–789.
- Zhou, X., Liu, S., Kim, E. S., Herbst, R. S., and Lee, J. J. (2008). Bayesian adaptive design for targeted therapy development in lung cancer—a step toward personalized medicine. *Clinical Trials*, 5(3):181–193.







Figure 1: Summary of observational, non-randomized data in IMPACT trial. The plot compares Kaplan Meier plots for PFS under TT versus O. The lack of randomization prevents a causal interpretation.




Scenario 3



Scenario 4



Scenario 5



Scenario 6

Figure 2: The average percentage of patients allocated to O and TT in each mutation-tumor pair with treatment effect different from the overall population under the simulation truth.




Figure 3: In each scenario, the left panel shows the simulation truth. Blue cells represent mutation-tumor pairs with treatment effect different from the overall population under the simulation truth; the right panel shows a heatmap of $Pr(a)$, the probability (under repeated simulation) of reporting each mutation-tumor pair.




Figure 4: The differences between the estimated treatment effect and true treatment effect for each mutation-tumor pair under NAIVE, SEPARATE, and OURS.

	BRCA	Ovary	Lung
FGFR	15	20	5
BRAF	10	100	60
PIK3CA	50	30	5
PTEN	13	25	5
MET	12	30	20

Table 1: Sample sizes in mutation-tumor pairs.

Scenario	Overall trt	Interactions
1	0	none
2	0.4	none
3	0	BRAF*Lung*z (0.4)
4	0	PIK3CA*BRCA*z (0.3), BRAF*Lung*z (0.3) PTEN*Lung*z(0.4)
5	0	PIK3CA*BRCA*z (0.3), BRAF*Ovary*z (0.4) BRAF*Lung*z(0.3)
6	0	BRAF*BRCA(0.4), BRAF*Ovary*z (0.3), BRAF*Lung*z(0.4)

Table 2: Simulation truth for 6 scenarios. The 2nd column reports the true overall treatment effect, that is the regression coefficient of the treatment indicator z_i in a log normal regression model. The 3rd column report interactions between tumor types, mutations and z_i (if present). The value in parentheses is the corresponding regression coefficient in the simulation truth.

Scenario	TIE	TSR	TPR	FSR	FNR	FPR
1	0.05	-	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	.90	-	-	-
3	-	.88	-	.04	.10	.00
4	-	.66	-	.05	.04	.00
5	-	.77	-	.03	.01	.00
6	-	.78	-	.02	.03	.00

Table 3: Simulation Results. The table shows six different error rates for the subpopulation finding report, including $\text{TIE} = \Pr(H_0^c \mid H_0)$; $\text{TSR} = \Pr(a \mid a)$; $\text{TPR} = \Pr(H_1 \mid H_1)$; $\text{FSR} = \Pr(a \mid a^c)$; $\text{FNR} = \Pr(H_0 \mid H_0^c)$; and $\text{FPR} = \Pr(H_1 \mid H_1^c)$.